

1  
2 73. A target resource stored in a storage medium which is constructed  
3 according to the steps recited in claim 39.

4  
5 74. A computer programmed to perform the following steps:  
6 constructing digital data to support interactive functionality with a video  
7 content program, the digital data being configured to permit a viewer to  
8 interactively control display of supplemental content along with the video content  
9 program;

10 defining a display layout of how the supplemental content and the video  
11 content program are displayed in relation to one another; and

12 encoding the digital data with instructions to dynamically change the  
13 display layout of the supplemental content and the video content program.

14  
15 **REMARKS**

16 Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the subject  
17 application as amended herein.

18 **ELECTION/RESTRICTIONS**

19 The Examiner has made a requirement for restriction. In response to this  
20 requirement for restriction, Applicants provisionally elect the Group I invention  
21 corresponding to claims 56-57, and 61-67.

22  
23 **THE NONSTATUTORY DOUBLE PATENTING REJECTION**

24 The Examiner has rejected claims 56-57, 61-67 under the judicially created  
25 doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims

1 of U.S. Patent 6,240,555. A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with  
2 37 CFR §1.321(c) may be used to overcome the rejection provided U.S. Patent  
3 6,240,555 is shown to be commonly owned with this application.

4 A terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR §1.321(c) and showing  
5 that U.S. Patent 6,240,555 is shown to be commonly owned with this application  
6 is transmitted contemporaneously with this paper.

7 **35 U.S.C CLAIM §112 REJECTION**

8 The Examiner has rejected claims 61-67 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being  
9 indefinite because the terms “the program” and “the associated program” in claims  
10 61 and 64-68 lack an antecedent basis. In response to this rejection, Applicants  
11 have amended claims 61, 62, and 64-67, to make more clear the antecedent  
12 relationship for the term “program,” as well as the association between the terms  
13 “target resource,” “target specification,” and “program.” No new matter has been  
14 added, and no elements have been narrowed or changed in meaning.  
15

16 **35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTION**

17 The Examiner has rejected claims 56, 61, and 63-66 as being unpatentable  
18 over Howe (US 5,892,508) in view of Palmer (US 5,905,865).

19 The Examiner has rejected claims 57, 62, and 67 as being unpatentable over  
20 Howe (US 5,892,508) in view of Palmer (US 5,905,865) and in view of Miller  
21 (US 5,585,866).

22 Applicants respectfully traverse the §103(a) rejection.

23 **Claim 56**  
24  
25

1 Applicants respectfully submit that claim 56 is not obvious over Howe in  
2 view of Palmer for two reasons, any one being sufficient to render claim 56 not  
3 obvious over Howe in view of Palmer.

4 First, Applicants submit that Howe and Palmer, together or alone, do not  
5 describe all the elements recited in Applicants' claim 56. Applicants recite in  
6 claim 56 a viewer computing unit for receiving and displaying continuous video  
7 content programs, comprising at least 3 elements that are neither in Howe nor  
8 Palmer: (1) an Internet browser that is dynamically loadable (2) for execution on a  
9 processor that is part of the viewer computing unit for receiving and displaying  
10 continuous video content programs, (3) when a tuner that is part of the viewer  
11 computing unit is tuned to a channel carrying a video content program that is  
12 interactive.

13 Howe describes an apparatus and method to transmit to a set top box an  
14 address of interactive video content. Signals containing programming furnished  
15 by content providers may have inserted into them interactive callback addresses  
16 (ICA) by disclosed insertion mechanisms [Col. 7 line 64-67, Co. 11 line 52-54,  
17 Col. 13 line 30-33, Col. 15 line 11-14, Col. 16 line 45-47, Col. 17 line 65, Col. 18  
18 line 19-20, Col. 19 line 25-26, Col. 23 line 20-24, Co. 24 line 49-52, Col. 26 line  
19 20-24, Col. 27 line 58-61]. An ICA consists of the network address and the  
20 application ID for the associated interactive component. [Col. 8 line 12-16].

21 Palmer describes a television 82 to receive broadcast programs, and a  
22 separate non-coupled computer system 40, that includes a coupled computer  
23 display 48, to receive and display data at the same time that a television program is  
24 broadcast to a television. The system described by Palmer is not an interactive  
25 television system.

1 Palmer, in greater detail, describes a radio and/or television 80 81 82  
2 receiving radio and/or television programs from a broadcaster 90 [Col. 4 line 32-  
3 34, Col. 5 line 25, Col. 8 line 51-53], while at the same time, a separate and  
4 unconnected processor 40/44 [FIG. 1, Col. 5 line 29-31. Col. 5 line 29-32, Col. 6  
5 line 52-58, Col. 7 line 8-18, Col. 8 line 47-53, Col. 9 line 45-59, Col. 12 line 3-23]  
6 receives a page from a receiver 30 [Col. 6 line 12-13], and data at a network  
7 address contained in the page [Col. 4 line 64-65]. The computer 40 sends the  
8 address to an internet service provider to allow the computer 40 to receive data  
9 from a website associated with the address. [Col. 5 line 3-10]. The processor  
10 40/44 receives the data by way of a browser [Col. 5 line 5-6, 16]. Palmer does not  
11 describe the browser as loadable or as dynamically loadable. The processor 40/44  
12 has a coupled computer screen 48 that displays information from the websites  
13 simultaneously with the broadcasting that displays on the television [FIG. 1, Col. 5  
14 line 29-31]. The computer screen is for displaying the network data and not for  
15 displaying the television programs. [Col. 5 line 29-32, Col. 6 line 52-58, Col. 7  
16 line 8-11, Col. 8 line 47-53, Col. 9 line 45-59]. "This turns the receiver's  
17 computer into a directed video kiosk controlled and programmed by the television  
18 and radio broadcaster." [Col. 5 line 35-38].

19 As for element (1) above, the Examiner comments that Howe does not  
20 disclose an Internet browser that is dynamically loadable for execution on the  
21 processor. Applicants agree. Palmer mentions an Internet browser at Col. 5 lines  
22 6, 16, 21, and 65; and Col. 6 lines 1, 4, 5, and 26. Palmer does not describe  
23 anywhere that the browser is dynamically loadable as recited by Applicants.  
24 Neither Howe nor Palmer describe a browser that is "dynamically loadable."  
25 Thus, Howe and Palmer do not describe Applicants' element (1).

1 As for element (2), Howe nowhere mentions a “browser” nor a  
2 “dynamically loadable browser,” and Palmer does not mention a “dynamically  
3 loadable browser,” as recited by Applicants. Palmer mentions a “browser” for  
4 execution on a computer 40, wherein the computer 40 which does not receive  
5 video programs, and is described as separate from a television 80 82 which is for  
6 receiving and displaying video programs. The computer is not a part of a viewer  
7 computing unit for receiving and displaying video content programs, as recited by  
8 Applicants. Thus, Howe and Palmer do not describe Applicants’ element (2).

9 As for element (3), Howe nowhere mentions a “browser” nor a  
10 “dynamically loadable browser,” and Palmer does not mention a “dynamically  
11 loadable browser,” as recited by Applicants. Palmer mentions a “browser” for  
12 execution on a computer 40 wherein the computer 40 is described as separate from  
13 a television 80 82, and therefore not a part of a viewer computing unit, as recited  
14 by Applicants. Even if in some way Palmer does describe a dynamically loadable  
15 browser that is part of a viewer computing unit for receiving and displaying video  
16 programs, Palmer does not mention, much less describe, that the browser is loaded  
17 and executed on a viewer unit when a tuner that is part of the viewer unit is tuned  
18 to a channel carrying an interactive video program, as recited by Applicants. In  
19 Palmer, the computer that executes the browser is separate and independent of the  
20 television 80 that includes the tuner. Thus, Palmer’s computer 40 does not include  
21 a television tuner, and further, the television tuner in Palmer need not be tuned to a  
22 television program, when the browser in Palmer is loaded and is executing, as  
23 recited by Applicants. Further, Palmer nowhere describes video programs that are  
24 interactive, so the television tuner in Palmer does not receive interactive programs,  
25

1 as recited by Applicants. Thus, Howe and Palmer do not describe Applicants'  
2 element (3).

3 Because Howe and Palmer, together or alone, do not at least describe  
4 Applicants' element (1), Applicants' element (2), and Applicants' element (3),  
5 Howe and Palmer, alone or together, do not describe all the elements recited by  
6 Applicants.

7 The second reason that claim 56 is patentable over Howe in view of Palmer  
8 is that there is no suggestion,, and teaching in Howe to combine the teachings of  
9 Howe with Palmer. The Examiner suggests that it would be obvious to combine  
10 Howe with Palmer to reduce labor cost. Applicants respectfully point out that a  
11 commercial motivation is not an engineering consideration, as required for a prima  
12 facie case of obviousness, and that the issue of "labor cost" is not discussed in  
13 Howe nor Palmer. Howe describes an apparatus and method to transmit to a set  
14 top box an address of interactive video content. Howe is not concerned with how  
15 the interactive video content is provided to a set top box, only mentioning that the  
16 interactive video content may be provided over a "network". Howe only  
17 mentions in passing that the messages can be in a WAN-compatible protocol, such  
18 as IP [Col. 22 line 43-45] (for which browsers are currently available). Palmer  
19 does not even describe an interactive television system, and does not describe a  
20 browser that is "dynamically loadable." Accordingly, there is no suggestion, there  
21 is no motivation, and there is no teaching in Howe to combine the teachings of  
22 Howe with Palmer. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner provide a  
23 specific indication in Howe of any suggestion, motivation, or of any teaching in  
24 Howe to combine Howe with Palmer.  
25

1 Therefore, claim 56 is not obvious over Howe in view of Palmer both  
2 because it recites elements not described in Howe or Palmer, and because there is  
3 no suggestion, motivation, or teaching to combine Howe with Palmer.

4 **Claim 57**

5 Applicant's claims 57 is dependent upon and further limiting independent  
6 claim 56. Claim 57 is allowable for that reason as well as for the additional  
7 limitations it contains.

8 Claim 57 recites "an electronic programming guide (EPG) stored in the  
9 memory and executable on the processor to organize programming information,  
10 the EPG associating a target specification to a target resource with a video content  
11 program." The Examiner comments that neither Howe nor Palmer disclose an  
12 EPG stored in memory and executable on the processor to organize program  
13 information. The Examiner admits that Miller discloses the EPG as recited by  
14 Applicants. Applicants respectfully traverse. Miller describes an EPG which  
15 provides the user with schedule information for programs [illustratively Col. 1 line  
16 10-13] and not to associate a target specification to a target resource with a video  
17 content program, as recited by Applicants. Howe, Palmer, and Miller do not  
18 describe this claim 57 element.

19 Moreover, there is no suggestion, motivation, and teaching in Howe to  
20 combine the teachings of Howe with Miller. Howe describes an apparatus and  
21 method to transmit to a set top box an address of interactive video content. Howe  
22 does not even mention a programming guide. Miller describes a program guide to  
23 provide information about televised programs to a user, not data regarding  
24 interactive television. Accordingly, there is no suggestion, there is no motivation,  
25 and there is no teaching in Howe to combine the teachings of Howe with Miller.

1 Applicants respectfully request the Examiner provide a specific indication in  
2 Howe of any suggestion, motivation, or of any teaching in Howe to combine  
3 Howe with Miller.

4 Therefore, claim 57 is not obvious over Howe in view of Palmer both  
5 because it recites elements not described in Howe, Palmer, or Miller, and because  
6 there is no suggestion, motivation, or teaching to combine Howe with Palmer or  
7 Miller.

8 **Claim 61**

9 Applicants respectfully submit that claim 61 is not obvious over Howe in  
10 view of Palmer for two reasons, any one being sufficient to render claim 61 not  
11 obvious over Howe in view of Palmer.

12 First, Applicants submit that Howe and Palmer, together or alone, do not  
13 describe all the elements recited in Applicants' claim 61. The Examiner  
14 comments that the analysis for claim 61 corresponds to the analysis for claim 56.  
15 As submitted by the Applicants with respect to claim 56 above, Howe and Palmer,  
16 together or alone, do not describe all the elements recited by Applicants.

17 In addition to the elements cited with respect to claim 56, Applicants recite  
18 in claim 61, the step: "in an event that the program is interactive compatible,  
19 retrieving a target specification associated with the program and dynamically  
20 launching an Internet browser to activate the target resource in support of  
21 interactive functionality." Applicants respectfully submit that neither Howe nor  
22 Palmer describes "dynamically launch[ing]" an Internet browser, as recited by  
23 Applicants. Howe does not describe a browser. Applicants respectfully submit  
24 that if Palmer somehow describes "dynamically launch[ing]" an Internet browser,  
25 Palmer does not describe so launching "in an event that the program is interactive



1 compatible,” as recited by Applicants, because at least Palmer does not describe an  
2 interactive system. Applicants respectfully submit that if Palmer somehow  
3 describes both “dynamically launch[ing]” an Internet browser, and so launching  
4 “in an event that the program is interactive compatible,” Palmer does not describe  
5 so launching “in support of interactive functionality,” as recited by the Applicants,  
6 because again, at least Palmer does not describe an interactive system.

7 Howe and Palmer, alone or together, do not describe all the elements  
8 recited by Applicants.

9 The second reason that claim 61 is patentable over Howe in view of Palmer  
10 is that, as submitted with respect to claim 56, there is no suggestion, motivation,  
11 and teaching in Howe to combine the teachings of Howe with Palmer. Applicants  
12 respectfully request the Examiner provide a specific indication if any suggestion,  
13 motivation, or teaching to combine Howe with Palmer.

14 Therefore, claim 61 is not obvious over Howe in view of Palmer both  
15 because it recites elements not described in Howe or Palmer, and because there is  
16 no suggestion, motivation, or teaching to combine Howe with Palmer.

17 **Claim 62**

18 Applicant’s claims 62 is dependent upon and further limiting independent  
19 claim 61. Claim 62 is allowable for that reason as well as for the additional  
20 limitations it contains.

21 Claim 62 recites:

22 “the target specifications are correlated with the program in a  
23 program listing, and further comprising the following steps:  
24 checking the program listing to ascertain whether the program  
25 is interactive compatible; and

1 determining that the program is interactive compatible by  
2 presence of a target specification being associated with the program  
3 in the program listing.”

4 As discussed with reference to claim 57 above, Miller describes an EPG  
5 which provides the user with schedule information for programs [illustratively  
6 Col. 1 line 10-13] and does not describe target specifications for interactive  
7 supplemental content as recited by Applicants. The examiner cites a section of  
8 Miller [Col. 8 line 20 -Col. 9 line 28] to indicate that Miller discloses target  
9 specification to indicate program interactivity. Applicants respectfully traverse.  
10 Applicants submit that the cited section of Miller describes the circuit that  
11 maintains Miller’s program guide system, and not that Miller’s program guide  
12 contains target specifications to indicate program interactivity.

13 As submitted with respect to claim 57, there is no suggestion, motivation,  
14 and teaching in Howe to combine the teachings of Howe with Miller. Applicants  
15 respectfully request the Examiner provide a specific indication if any suggestion,  
16 motivation, or teaching to combine Howe with Miller.

17 Therefore, claim 62 is not obvious over Howe in view of Palmer both  
18 because it recites elements not described in Howe, Palmer, or Miller, and because  
19 there is no suggestion, motivation, or teaching to combine Howe with Palmer or  
20 Miller.

21 **Claim 63**

22 Applicants’ claim 63 is dependent upon and further limiting independent  
23 claim 61. Claim 63 is allowable for that reason as well as for the additional  
24 limitations it contains.  
25

1 Therefore, claim 63 is not obvious over Howe in view of Palmer both  
2 because it recites elements not described in Howe or Palmer, and because there is  
3 no suggestion, motivation, or teaching to combine Howe with Palmer.

4 **Claim 64**

5 Applicants respectfully submit that claim 64 is not obvious over Howe in  
6 view of Palmer for two reasons, any one being sufficient to render claim 64 not  
7 obvious over Howe in view of Palmer.

8 First, Applicants submit that Howe and Palmer, together or alone, do not  
9 describe all the elements recited in Applicants' claim 64.

10 Applicants recite at least 2 elements in claim 64 that are neither in Howe  
11 nor Palmer: (1) determining if a video content program is interactive compatible  
12 by checking a channel separate from said program channel for presence of the  
13 supplemental content in conjunction with the program being received on said  
14 program channel, and (2) in an event that the program is interactive compatible,  
15 retrieving a target specification associated with the program and dynamically  
16 launching an Internet browser to activate the target resource in support of  
17 interactive functionality for the associated program.

18 As for element (1), Palmer does not describe a interactive video or  
19 supplemental content, as recited by Applicants. Howe no where describes  
20 checking a channel separate from said program channel for presence of the  
21 supplemental content in conjunction with the program being received on said  
22 program channel, as recited by Applicants. Instead, Palmer describes checking the  
23 same channel for presence of the supplemental content [Col. 11 line 52-55, Col. 13  
24 line 30-32, Col. 15 line 11-14, Col. 16 line 45-47]. Thus, Howe and Palmer do not  
25 describe Applicants' element (1).

1 As for element (2), Howe does not describe a browser as discussed with  
2 reference to claim 56. Palmer does not describe dynamically launching a browser  
3 as discussed with reference to claim 56.

4 Because Howe and Palmer, together or alone, do not at least describe  
5 Applicants' element (1) and Applicants' element (2), Howe and Palmer, alone or  
6 together, do not describe all the elements recited by Applicants.

7 The second reason that claim 64 is patentable over Howe in view of Palmer  
8 is that, as submitted with respect to claim 56, there is no suggestion, motivation,  
9 and teaching in Howe to combine the teachings of Howe with Palmer. Applicants  
10 respectfully request the Examiner provide a specific indication if any suggestion,  
11 motivation, or teaching to combine Howe with Palmer.

12 Therefore, claim 64 is not obvious over Howe in view of Palmer both  
13 because it recites elements not described in Howe or Palmer, and because there is  
14 no suggestion, motivation, or teaching to combine Howe with Palmer.

15 **Claim 65**

16 Applicants respectfully submit that claim 65 is not obvious over Howe in  
17 view of Palmer for two reasons, any one being sufficient to render claim 65 not  
18 obvious over Howe in view of Palmer.

19 First, Applicants submit that Howe and Palmer, together or alone, do not  
20 describe all the elements recited in Applicants' claim 65. The Examiner  
21 comments that the analysis for claim 65 corresponds to the analysis for claim 64.  
22 As submitted by the Applicants with respect to claim 64 above, Howe and Palmer,  
23 together or alone, do not describe all the elements recited by Applicants.

24 In addition to the elements cited with respect to claim 64, Applicants recite  
25 in claim 65, the step of "launching an Internet browser to activate the target

1 resource in support of interactive functionality for the program.” As discussed  
2 with reference to claims 56 and 61-64 above, Howe does not describe a browser.  
3 Moreover, Palmer does not describe launching an internet browser, as recited by  
4 Applicants. Even if in some way Palmer does describe launching an internet  
5 browser, Palmer does not launch the browser in support of interactive functionality  
6 for the [video content] program, as recited by Applicants. Palmer does not  
7 describe interactive functionality of video programs as described with reference to  
8 claim 56 above.

9         Howe and Palmer, alone or together, do not describe all the elements  
10 recited by Applicants.

11         The second reason that claim 65 is patentable over Howe in view of Palmer  
12 is, as submitted with respect to claim 56, there is no suggestion, motivation, and  
13 teaching in Howe to combine the teachings of Howe with Palmer. Applicants  
14 respectfully request the Examiner provide a specific indication if any suggestion,  
15 motivation, or teaching to combine Howe with Palmer.

16         Therefore, claim 65 is not obvious over Howe in view of Palmer both  
17 because it recites elements not described in Howe or Palmer, and because there is  
18 no suggestion, motivation, or teaching to combine Howe with Palmer.

#### 19 **Claim 66**

20         Applicants respectfully submit that claim 66 is not obvious over Howe in  
21 view of Palmer for two reasons, any one being sufficient to render claim 66 not  
22 obvious over Howe in view of Palmer.

23         First, Applicants submit that Howe and Palmer, together or alone, do not  
24 describe all the elements recited in Applicants’ claim 66. The Examiner  
25 comments that the analysis for claim 66 corresponds to the analysis for claim 64.

1 As submitted by the Applicants with respect to claim 64 and claim 65 above,  
2 Howe and Palmer, together or alone, do not describe all the elements recited by  
3 Applicants.

4 Second , as discussed by Applicants with respect to claim 56, there is no  
5 suggestion, motivation, and teaching in Howe to combine the teachings of Howe  
6 with Palmer. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner provide a specific  
7 indication if any suggestion, motivation, or teaching to combine Howe with  
8 Palmer.

9 Therefore, claim 66 is not obvious over Howe in view of Palmer both  
10 because it recites elements not described in Howe or Palmer, and because there is  
11 no suggestion, motivation, or teaching to combine Howe with Palmer.

12 **Claim 67**

13 Applicants respectfully submit that claim 67 is not obvious over Howe in  
14 view of Palmer and in view of Miller for two reasons, any one being sufficient to  
15 render claim 67 not obvious over Howe in view of Palmer and Miller.

16 First, Applicants submit that Howe, Palmer, and Miller, together or alone,  
17 do not describe all the elements recited in Applicants' claim 67. The Examiner  
18 comments that the analysis for claim 67 corresponds to the analysis for claim 62.  
19 As submitted by the Applicants with respect to claim 62, Howe and Palmer,  
20 together or alone, do not describe all the elements recited by Applicants.

21 In addition to the elements cited with respect to claim 62, the Applicants  
22 recite: "automatically displaying the interactive supplement content together with  
23 the interactive compatible program (for a video content program upon tuning to a  
24 channel carrying the program)." The Examiner comments that Miller (FIG. 11)  
25 discloses "displaying the interactive supplement content together with the

1 interactive compatible program.” Applicants traverse. Applicants respectfully  
2 submit that Miller does not describe this element of claim 67. Miller displays in  
3 FIG. 11 program information from a program guide and not interactive  
4 supplemental content, as recited by Applicants. As discussed with reference to  
5 claim 57, Miller describes a program guide which provides the user with schedule  
6 information for programs [illustratively Col. 1 line 10-13], and not with data for  
7 interactive programming. In fact, the information portrayed in FIG. 1 is  
8 programming information that specifically need not be for the channel currently  
9 being viewed [Col. 13 line 21-24], whereas Applicants recite that the supplemental  
10 content is for the tuned program. Howe, Palmer, and Miller together or alone, do  
11 not describe all the elements recited by Applicants

12 The second reason that claim 67 is patentable over Howe in view of Palmer  
13 and Miller is that, as submitted with respect to claim 57, there is no suggestion,  
14 motivation, and teaching in Howe to combine the teachings of Howe with Miller.  
15 Applicants respectfully request the Examiner provide a specific indication if any  
16 suggestion, motivation, or teaching to combine Howe with Miller.

17 Therefore, claim 67 is not obvious over Howe in view of Palmer both  
18 because it recites elements not described in Howe, Palmer, or Miller, and because  
19 there is no suggestion, motivation, or teaching to combine Howe with Palmer or  
20 Miller.

## 21 22 CONCLUSION

23 Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of these  
24 claims in view of the above amendments and remarks. Applicants respectfully  
25 submit that claims 56, 57, and 61-67, are not obvious over the cited references.

1 Thus, the claims are in condition for allowance. Should any matter in this case  
2 remain unresolved, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone  
3 conference with the Examiner to resolve any such outstanding matter.

4 Respectfully Submitted,  
5 LEE & HAYES PLLC  
6 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500  
7 SPOKANE, WA 99201

8 Date: Nov 1, 2012

9 Kenneth Paley  
10 Kenneth Paley  
11 Reg. No. 38,989  
12 (509) 324-9256 x217  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25



**ATTACHMENT**

In accordance with CFR § 1.121, a marked-up version of amended claims 61, 62, and 64-67 showing all changes relative to the previous version of those claims is given below:

61. (Amended) A computer-implemented method for activating interactive supplemental content for a video content program upon tuning to a channel carrying the program, comprising the following steps:

determining if the program is interactive compatible, where an interactive compatible program[s] is[are] associated with target resources containing data which supports interactive functionality in conjunction with the [associated] program[s], the target resources being located by corresponding target specifications; and

in an event that the program is interactive compatible, retrieving a target specification associated with the program and dynamically launching an Internet browser to activate the target resource in support of interactive functionality for the[ associated] program.

62. (Amended) A computer-implemented method as recited in claim 61, wherein the target specifications are correlated with the[associated] program[s] in a program listing, and further comprising the following steps:

checking the program listing to ascertain whether the program is interactive compatible; and

determining that the program is interactive compatible by presence of a target specification being associated with the program in the program listing.

50321  
1 64. (Amended) A computer-implemented method for activating interactive  
2 supplemental content for a video content program upon tuning to a channel  
3 carrying the program, comprising the following steps:

4 determining if the program is interactive compatible by checking a channel  
5 separate from said program channel for presence of the supplemental content in  
6 conjunction with the program being received on said program channel, where an  
7 interactive compatible program[s] is[are] associated with target resources  
8 containing data which support interactive functionality in conjunction with the  
9 [associated] program[s], the target resources being located by corresponding target  
10 specifications; and

11 in an event that the program is interactive compatible, retrieving a target  
12 specification associated with the program and dynamically launching an Internet  
13 browser to activate the target resources in support of interactive functionality for  
14 the [associated ]program.

15  
16 65. (Amended) A computer-implemented method for activating interactive  
17 supplemental content for a video content program upon tuning to a channel  
18 carrying the program, comprising the following steps:

19 determining if the program is interactive compatible, where an interactive  
20 compatible program[s] is[are] associated with target resources containing data  
21 which support interactive functionality in conjunction with the [associated  
22 ]program[s], the target resources being located by corresponding target  
23 specifications;

24 displaying an icon to visually inform the viewer that the program is  
25 interactive compatible; and

5001/

1 in an event that the program is interactive compatible, retrieving a target  
2 specification associated with the program and launching an Internet browser to  
3 activate the target resource in support of interactive functionality for the  
4 [associated ]program.

6 66. (Amended) A computer-implemented method for activating interactive  
7 supplemental content for a video content program upon tuning to a channel  
8 carrying the program, comprising the following steps:

9 determining if the program is interactive compatible, where an interactive  
10 compatible program[s] is[are] associated with target resources containing data  
11 which supports interactive functionality in conjunction with the[ associated]  
12 program[s], the target resources being located by corresponding target  
13 specifications;

14 displaying the interactive supplement content in response to the viewer  
15 activating the icon; and

16 in an event that the program is interactive compatible, retrieving a target  
17 specification associated with the program and launching an Internet browser to  
18 activate the target resource in support of interactive functionality for the  
19 [associated ]program.

21 67. (Amended) A computer-implemented method for activating interactive  
22 supplemental content for a video content program upon tuning to a channel  
23 carrying the program, comprising the following steps:

24 determining if the program is interactive compatible, where an interactive  
25 compatible program[s] is[are] associated with target resources containing data

1 which support interactive functionality in conjunction with the[ associated]  
2 program[s], the target resources being located by corresponding target  
3 specifications;

4 in an event that the program is interactive compatible, retrieving a target  
5 specification associated with the program and launching an Internet browser to  
6 activate the target resource in support of interactive functionality for the  
7 [associated ]program; and

8 automatically displaying the interactive supplement content together with  
9 the interactive compatible program.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25